



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ENGLISH IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS; A REVIEW

SO MUCH has been written about the study of English in the secondary schools in the last decade, that it is becoming impossible for a teacher to read even the best that is offered him. Articles in leading reviews discuss one detail after another or propose this and that scheme, until we lose our way in the network of discussion. It will perhaps not seem ill-timed for a practicing teacher to examine the general problem from a practical standpoint; to sum up the results of previous investigation and discussion and to propose a plan of work that shall, at least in intent, be free from personal prejudice and determined only by careful weighing of the various ideals that have been offered us.

First, what branches of English work are desirable before the college age? All sorts of studies are taught in our schools under the name of English, and more are clamoring for admission. The Committee of Ten subordinate everything to two objects; (1) to enable the pupil to understand the expressed thoughts of others and to give expression to thoughts of his own: (2) to cultivate a taste for reading, to give the pupil some acquaintance with good literature, and to furnish him with the means of extending that acquaintance.¹ The more sanguine Committee on Entrance Requirements hope to secure "sympathetic and comprehensive appreciation of the writings of great thinkers, and the power to use language in a clear, logical, convincing and agreeable manner."² Various writers plead also for argumentation, history of literature, rhetoric, versification, logic, formal grammar, historical grammar, philosophy, science, history, biography, etymology, Anglo-Saxon.³

Such is the chaos out of which the teacher of school-English

¹ Report of Committee of Ten, p. 86.

² Report of Committee on College Entrance Requirements, p. 13.

³ This sentence is based on some twenty urgent articles in five leading educational magazines.

must evolve his particular aims; for though these aims are all worthy, are all interesting, they are not all of equal worth in the school. We should examine them with care and discover what peculiar interests and power each yields.

It seems to me that all the interests and powers of the fore-named subjects are included in the following classification.

1. *Practical*.—The so-called school-arts of reading, writing, and speaking; the training necessary to teach children to read understandingly and to express their thoughts intelligently.

2. *Conventional*.—Those kinds of training which the fashion of our day demands of a man who expects to rise socially. The only strong conventional interest in English, in America, is the demand for not merely intelligibility, but accuracy of expression; freedom from barbarism in spelling, capitalization, punctuation, grammar, and pronunciation. Slips in these details have a decidedly greater deterrent effect on a man's social rise than lack of information; they are strong conventional interests. Formal or systematic grammar, rhetoric, and etymology are supported partly by conventional interest, from having been taught so long in the schools.

3. *Scientific*.—The vast number of aims to train the mind in one direction or another, or to store it with useful knowledge. It includes (*a*) the systematic study of the language; *i. e.*, scientific grammar, historical grammar, old and middle English, etymology; (*b*) the fine art of expression, above the stage of mere correct simplicity; *i. e.* the principles of rhetoric and, in detail, the study of argumentation, poetics, etc.; (*c*) all study of literature whose aim is not chiefly to enjoy, but to explain; historical work, tracing sources, influences from foreign literatures, rise and decay of literary forms, and the like; (*d*) the acquisition of miscellaneous information in connection with English work, as, the so-called science-readers; also mythology, history, antiquities.

4. *Esthetic*.—This is familiar enough under the frequently repeated expressions, "to cultivate a taste for good reading," to "train the imagination," the "appreciation," and so on. The esthetic and the scientific point of view might include the

study of the same books, but one would regard them as sources of information, the other as works of art.

5. *Ethical*.—The reading of books which have an expressed or implied moral purpose, the direct inculcation of moral precept, and the insistence on truthfulness, purity, and other virtues in composition-work.

These, then, are the possible aims of work in English; no longer a chaos, but at least in a nebulous state. But before we allow our nebula to organize still further into school work and college work distinctively, we must examine two things. These are (*a*) the actual condition of sub-freshmen (supposedly the best product of our schools) thus discovering their most crying needs; (*b*) the amount of available school time in which these needs can be met.

The examination of sub-freshmen is done yearly at the colleges, and its results are most instructively set forth in a paper prepared by Miss Withey, under the direction of Professor Hill.¹ Miss Withey carefully read all the books written at the examinations in English, in 1896, by candidates for admission to Harvard College—namely, 894 books. Of these, only 16.8 per cent. received a mark above C, the mark of mediocrity, and in this 16.8 per cent. are included 117 books marked C+, leaving only 3.8 per cent. that were really meritorious. From the remaining 96.2 per cent. the writer draws conclusions, backed by copious quotation, that are startling. There are three closely printed pages of words badly misspelled—spellings like “freind,” “pursuad,” “ment,” “fleash,” “falsly,” “terrible,” “ruther,” “enterance,” “familly,” “compulsion,” “dys,” “mizor,” “Venic;” these examples being taken from the most numerous classes. There are four pages of grotesque punctuation; “Silas Marner, had saved up, a large bag of gold” is by no means the worst specimen. Barbarisms in the use of familiar words, inexcusable redundancy, incongruity, are abundantly shown, not to mention such grammatical slips as “a empty bottle,” “asked . . . who it belonged to,” “attended church

¹WITHEY, ELIZABETH ABORN, Sub-freshman English, *Educational Review*, Vol. XIV, p. 468, and Vol. XV, p. 55.

regular," and the like. Long, loose sentences, both awkward and obscure, are the rule. Ablative absolutes and split infinitives abound. In very many books the paragraphing is wholly unintelligent. The books show utter disregard of the principle of unity, in paragraphs and in whole compositions.

Nor had the reading been done with intelligence. The examination was on *The Merchant of Venice*. Many candidates blundered over essential details, confusing Antonio with Bassanio, speaking of a choice of three "casks," or three "coffins." Similarly, in the September examination, "Comus is an epic poem;" "The description of Milton in Lycidas is very striking." As regards literary appreciation dullness is shown throughout. The books marked C and lower are almost all pointless; some absurdly pretentious, others sentimental. A question about the "Music of the Spheres" brought out the most astonishing set of answers (over twenty of them are printed), showing profound lack of understanding or enjoyment of the passage in question.

I have spent much time on Miss Withey's investigations, because they must modify our hopes in planning a course in English. They will at least show us that the present declared ideals of English teachers are not realized in practice, and will warn us against increasing them unless we can gain an increased time allotment.¹

What is the best time allotment for English in secondary schools? The schedules of a number of prominent schools show a strong time allotment in the grammar grades, followed by an average of $3\frac{5}{8}$ recitations a week throughout the high-school period. These are distributed through the four years in accordance with three distinct theories, as shown by the various textbooks and methods of work. Some schools begin with five, six, or even seven and a half periods a week, and lessen the time in later years on the theory that other studies, like foreign tongues, can replace English work. Others give English a constant allotment of three or four periods, believing that a boy should progress by regular steps from elementary to advanced

¹ See also on this general subject, HURLBUT, B. S., "College Requirements in English," *Academy*, Vol. VII, p. 257 [1892].

English; this is the arrangement proposed by the Committee of Ten. In other schools, English decreases early in the high-school course, but increases again the year before graduation; such schools believe that after a strong elementary training a period of several years follows in which a boy is too immature for higher English, and that he should for a while devote most of his energy to other subjects.

This last time-arrangement I believe to be the best. After the elementary steps, proficiency in composition and taste for literature can be obtained only by several years of constant writing and reading, which can be done with but few recitation periods. A boy cannot write with ease and force until he has reasonable accuracy, nor can he criticise without a fairly wide knowledge of books. The intermediate high-school years are crowded with other subjects that need time, and that also, if properly taught, afford English training. In short, the middle high-school years demand for other subjects time that English can well spare.

For a working scheme based on the preceding discussion, I should suggest that through the grammar grades pupils lay a solid foundation for English work by at least five periods a week; that this decrease to three in the first and second high-school years, increasing to four periods in the third, and five in the last year. The reason for the extra period in the fourth year is to gain some elementary practice in the principles to be applied more seriously later. The total amount of time demanded is a fair average of the time actually spent on English in good schools; its arrangement I think that best suited to the needs both of English and of other studies in the school.

In this time, then, are to be inculcated such of the aims of English teaching as belong properly to the schools. We must now return from our survey of the present condition of the schools and their products to the aims we have already learned to classify.

Now when Professor Hill rails against boys' English training, when Mr. Godkin writes on the "Illiteracy of American Boys,"¹ when M. Compayré pleads for a "Study of the Mother

¹GODKIN, E. L., *Educational Review*, Vol. XIII, p. 1.

Tongue,"¹ (French in his case but his arguments are equally applicable to English) when from near and far rises the cry for more English, for what do the complainants ask? More practical ability to read, to talk, to write? More scientific information about the language and literature? More highly developed interest in good reading, and better trained imaginations? More inspiration, through English work, to noble ideals?

I am convinced that if we sacrifice our laudable interest in scientific work; if we cast aside any conventional work that will not stand the test of practical utility, and devote ourselves strictly to developing ordinary accuracy and simplicity of expression and a hearty love for good literature, with the training of imagination and of the moral sense that must unconsciously flow from it—if we can bring this to pass, Professor Hill and our other critics will be abundantly satisfied. Able teachers uphold me in this opinion. J. H. Penniman writes that much of the present confusion might be avoided if a clear understanding could be reached concerning the division of work between school and college. "As matters now stand," he says, "the entire ground is gone over in the schools in a superficial way, and hence must be gone over again by the college."² Samuel Thurber limits composition work to spelling, penmanship, capitalization, punctuation, sentence-structure, and paragraphing.³ Byron Groce regards the most important aim as correct speaking and writing; to this end the pupil should read much intelligently, but without burying the text under a weight of comment and note-study; we must not demand much more than correctness.⁴ If we could, in the words of the committee on college entrance requirements, teach boys "sympathetic and comprehensive appreciation of the writings of great thinkers, and the power to use

¹COMPAYRÉ, GABRIEL, "The Study of the Mother Tongue," in his *Lectures on Pedagogy*. Translated by W. H. Payne. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1893, p. 325.

²PENNIMAN, J. H., "The Study of English in School and College," *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. I, p. 462.

³THURBER, SAMUEL, "Limitations of the Secondary Teaching of English Composition," *Education*, Vol. XIV, p. 193.

⁴GROCE, BYRON, "The Emphasis in the Teaching of English," *Academy*, Vol. VI, p. 529.

language in a clear, logical, convincing, and agreeable manner," school English departments would be a very paradise on earth; but unhappily few even of us teachers possess such unusual powers; we are apt to associate them with genius, or with prolonged and mature study. Can we demand them of children? Can we demand them of boys like those who in 1896 spelled miser "mizor," and punctuated the sentence, "Silas Marner, had saved up, a large bag of gold"? If the teacher offers the average boy Anglo-Saxon, historical grammar, philology, searching criticism, or tries to drill him in argumentative analysis or the finer qualities of style, he is deceiving himself. Such work is really not for the pupil's good, but the teacher's entertainment. Correct, simple expression and a real liking for literature—these are our aims. After these are attained, it will be time to introduce more; to undertake work fresher, freer from drudgery; but that time will usually be after the period of school education. When I speak of drudgery I mean drudgery for the teacher, not for the pupil; whatever else may bore the pupil, his interest must be aroused in English or all our efforts are vain. Even the teacher may solace his soul by incidental hints, references, five-minute talks, that will open to the pupil vistas into the world of higher English; and the literature work, if properly chosen, must make at least part of the teacher's work a perpetual delight. But after all the road to literary appreciation is marked by milestones of illiterate and painful lack of appreciation; while the road to simple, accurate writing and speech is thorny and hard at best.

Now, simple, accurate writing is to be achieved in only one way; and that way is constant practice. The old falsehood that English grammar teaches one to speak and write the English language has been exposed often enough; grammar is studying about English, not studying English. I once had a boy so carefully trained in the grammar school that he could parse the most entangled word in a seventeenth century quarto; his technical knowledge of grammar far exceeded what I knew, or ever want to know. Unhappily, he could not himself compose a page of writing free from gross error. He knew the science of grammar

but not the art of composition. This useful art can be learned, like all other crafts, only by practice under competent criticism. At least once a week, and, if possible, oftener, pupils should write simple themes. This should continue year by year throughout the entire course. These themes should be criticised with care, to the end that the pupils may attain an ideal not lofty but by no means to be despised—a simple, correct style.

This work, and still more the literature work, should be founded on interest. In all reading we must remember what our primary object is, not to inculcate miscellaneous information; not—at least at first—to give an idea of the history of the language or literature, merely to interest the pupil in worthy books. This alone is a sufficiently hard task, and demands our thoughtful study.

Interest, the psychologists tell us, depends on ability to connect the new object with something interesting already in the mind, and to hold the interest of pupils, we must discover what resident or natural interests they have, and make our work branch out in a sort of network from them. But here psychology deserts us.

Very little work has been done in this direction; none, that I have been able to find, in secondary schools, and in the lower schools hardly enough for satisfactory results.¹ They give, however, a few useful hints to the secondary-school teachers. They bring out clearly the great influences of outside reading among young boys and girls; they show a normal interest in adventure, among boys, and in sentiment, among girls, at the age of entering the high school; a strong interest in specific detail; acceptance of, and sometimes pleasure in, a deliberate moral; a liking for poetry; and a great preference for complete works rather than brief selections, which are usually totally forgotten.

My general scheme of work in literature in a high school would be this. I should start with a set of books that contained

¹ TRUE, M. B. C., "What My Pupils Read," *Education*, Vol. X, p. 42, and Vol. XIV, p. 99; WISSLER, CLARK, "The Interests of Children in the Reading Work of Elementary Schools," *Pedagogical Seminary*, Vol. V, p. 523; KIRKPATRICK, E. A., *Children's Reading*. Published by Miller: Lincoln, Neb.; GRIFFITH, GEORGE, "Course of Reading for Children," *Educational Review*, Vol. XVII, p. 65.

adventure enough for the boys, and sentiment enough for the girls. I should recommend varied lists for outside reading, of which pupils might choose freely the required number of books, on which they must in due time report. In the class, I should try to introduce, step by step, more varied interests ; using every means in my power to connect each new book, author, kind of literature or method of treatment, with something that I knew had held the pupils' interest in the past. If by mistake I took up a book that was obviously uninteresting to them, I should drop it as soon as possible, and avoid it in the future, and I should try constantly, of course, to increase my knowledge of what books pupils really liked—and act on it. After I had thus won their confidence in my literary advice, and put into their minds a considerable store of literature, I might venture on the historical method ; but that only toward the end.

This plan of work is very much in the air, and seems to have no regard for the college entrance requirements, to which we school-teachers are, for better or worse, bound. For the college examinations we must prepare some, and we should be willing to prepare all of our pupils. In order not to subvert our whole course in English to the minor purpose of examination-passing, I should confine the special preparation for the examinations to the last school year ; a plan which I have found perfectly feasible, and which for several reasons I regard as the best. It not only sends the boy to his test with a comparatively fresh remembrance of the books, but it enables the teacher to present the required books not as isolated phenomena, but in their relations, in so far as they have any.

We have found that the number of week-hours available for English as such is about fifteen, and that these are best distributed among the four years in the proportion, 3, 3, 4, and 5. We have further agreed to put off all thought of impending examination until the last year, leaving us three years in which to work our will with the pupils' taste. In these three years, what shall we read and how shall we read ?

In the first place, do not begin with a prescribed list. Before there can be any scientific basis for the construction of such a

list, it will be necessary to investigate the real likings of high-school girls and boys. Several lists will give good suggestions, as, the report of the Committee on Entrance Requirements, or the Harvard pamphlet;¹ but these are merely the opinions of teachers, not the results of investigation. Even if they were, it would be a mistake to prescribe them; "prearranged lists of books are fatal to inner, spontaneous interest. No one reads through a list except under duress. Not a list of items to be checked off, but a center, a starting point, is the true gift of the schoolroom Mentor to his learners."²

Discarding, then, any rigid system, the teacher should at once guide and follow the taste of the class. Find out first what book is already popular in the class—the chances are that a novel of Scott's or a poem of Longfellow's will have a prominent place. Begin by reading a book by the same author, or one that appeals to the same emotions. The taste, or rather the receptivity of your classes will vary from year to year. Some teachers have found boys who could heartily appreciate Chaucer, in spite of the difficulties of spelling and meter.³ Epics, from Jack the Giant-Killer to the *Iliad*, the Arthurian legend, usually hold boys, as do Crusoe, Don Quixote, and Scott; and no books could excel these in ethical teaching.⁴ If possible, use the Bible, the inspiration of nearly all our important men of letters; not interpreting it theologically, but as an interesting book to read.⁵ Such passages as 1 and 2 Maccabees, with the patriot Judas, the cruel Antiochus, imposing Greek culture at the sword's point, the appeal to the Roman senate, the charging elephants, will be sure to arouse an interest which may open

¹ "English in the Secondary Schools." A plan for work in English adapted to the program of the Committee of Ten. Published by Harvard University, 1897.

² THURBER, SAMUEL, *Introduction to the Select Essays of Macaulay*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

³ HINES, MRS. L. S., "The Study of English Literature," *Education*, Vol. IX, p. 229; also GUMMERE, F. B. "Poetry in the Schoolroom," *Academy*, Vol. II, p. 145.

⁴ BRUSIE, CHARLES F., "Literature as a Means of Moral Teaching," *Education*, Vol. XIV, p. 129.

⁵ PRINCE, JOHN T., "The Bible in Education," *Educational Review*, Vol. XVI, p. 353.

your pupils' eyes to the Bible as a fund of enjoyment. Shakespeare, in the simpler plays, is available throughout, preceded perhaps by Lamb's tales. Mr. Thurber urges us to select "the most stirring and kindling passages that express the primal conceptions of duty, heroism, self-sacrifice, courage, patriotism, faith, purity, love of nature, kindness, parental and filial devotion."¹ Throughout, we must remember that, while the man of science is intellectual and cognitive, the primary aim of the man of letters is esthetic and emotional, in the psychological sense of the term.² Hence we should, in all our literature, dwell on the esthetic and emotional aspects. Our constant aim should be to link book by book into the pupils' real interests, until they no longer think of a book we recommend as a grind, but will accept it as something to read for pure enjoyment.

What methods of teaching will best bring this result to pass? In the class room there must be much reading aloud. The teacher should himself be intensely interested in the books, and should read much himself, making every effort to bring out the emotional value of every word. The same effort should be required of the pupils; humdrum reading should be criticised, as well as the slurring of good poetry into bad prose. Much prose and poetry should be committed to memory and recited. I insist on this vocal interpretation, because language is, first of all, an art of speech, and only through speech can one learn the subtle rhythms of both prose and verse. There may also be textual study, but by no means study of notes. As Thurber says, notes forestall the teacher by putting problem and solution in juxtaposition.³ Such difficulties as come up should be given out as problems for research, in whatever reference books are at hand. A fully annotated edition will be a great convenience to the teacher; in the hands of the class it is stultifying. Besides class work, there must be a much greater amount of outside reading. This may be encouraged by means of a school library,

¹ THURBER, S., "English Literature in the Schools," *Academy*, Vol. VI., p. 486.

² MORGAN, C. LLOYD, *Psychology for Teachers*, London, 1894, chap. IX, p. 197.

³ THURBER, SAMUEL, "The Annotation of English Texts for School Use," *Academy*, Vol. X, p. 165.

carefully selected; suggestive lists of books will help, as well as the device of reading aloud from the most stirring part of a book, and then putting the book on the class shelf. After the class has read and liked several books of an author, it will be helpful to study his life. By the third year, *Hill's Rhetoric* may help to formulate likings already formed, and give a convenient nomenclature for future work. But the chief emphasis should always be laid on the books themselves—on the essential idea, and the beauty of the particular form the artist has chosen. Incidentally, the teacher may stimulate interest by telling beforehand what the book is about, the conditions under which it was written (or, if a play, produced), by reading aloud from books referred to; by telling anecdotes; in short by doing "anything to exalt and glorify the makers of literature."¹ By the fourth year, when they are to prepare for college, pupils will thus have read a large enough amount of literature to pursue the historical method. The teacher could, by weekly or bi-weekly lectures, trace the main outlines of literary development, say from the beginnings of the drama through the Romantic movement, giving at least one talk on each of the books for outside reading. The habit of taking notes, to be criticised by the teacher, will of itself be invaluable English training for a boy who is going to college. The class should study short lives of the four authors read in class, and should memorize a hundred or more lines from each author. I have found the foregoing scheme feasible, interesting, and productive of good results.

We may now take up the question of how to train the powers of expression, both oral and written. Oral expression I have already alluded to in connection with the reading of literature. In both reading and frequent elocution, aim to get the thought,

¹ THURBER, S., "How to Make the Study of Literature Interesting," *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. VI, p. 483. See also for valuable suggestions similar to articles by Mr. Thurber in *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. II, p. 321, and *Academy*, Vol. IV, p. 165; also GUMMERE, F. B., *School and College*, Vol. I, p. 84; GUMMERE, F. B., *Academy*, Vol. II, p. 145; HILL, MARGARET, *Academy*, Vol. VII, p. 84; MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *Educational Review*, Vol. III, p. 337; MACLAUGHLIN, E., *Educational Review*, Vol. V, p. 17; MAXEY, C. L., *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. I, p. 105; SPRING, L. W., *Education*, Vol. XIII, p. 83.

and express it by the voice. In cases of habitual mispronunciation, brief phonic drill will be helpful. A fruitful device, and one that always interests the class, is oral discussion of current events, each member of the class having a topic; the interest or apathy of the class will be a sufficient criterion of the manner of the reciter.

In approaching written composition, we enter a much debated subject. All agree, however, on the necessity for much writing, carefully criticised. Superintendent Maxwell's plan¹ of making the pupils criticise their own themes is, I think, impracticable, unless the teacher re-criticises them. As Mr. Buehler points out, the pupil, even if earnest, is not competent to criticise his own work: many of his faults are due to ignorance.² The teacher must correct the themes; for this reason one or two themes a week are sufficient. Moreover, the average boy does not have enough genuine thoughts to write themes daily, and perfunctory writing does more harm than good.

The subjects for themes may be chosen from any field of the pupils' interest and comprehension. I do not favor limiting theme-subjects to the books read, or to the school work in general; though subjects may profitably be chosen from these fields if the pupil shows especial interest. When possible, however, let the subject be what is uppermost in the pupils' minds. If they are excited about a question of school policy, let them write about it; if they are going to order a football, let them all write letters to the manufacturer; if they have been on an excursion, let them write accounts of it. The only rules for choosing a theme-subject are that it be specific, definite, and interesting to the pupil; a subject on which he has something to say.

Once written, the theme should be carefully corrected by the teacher, who should indicate by some arbitrary symbols the nature of the mistakes, leaving the pupil to find the specific correction. The teacher should have a regular hour for private conference, where he can point out to pupils their faults without

¹ MAXWELL, WILLIAM H, "An Experiment in Correcting Compositions," *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, p. 240.

² BUEHLER, HUBER GRAY, "On Correcting Compositions," *Educational Review*, Vol. VII, p. 492.

holding them up to ridicule. Faithful effort, even if blundering, he should encourage. Spare minutes in the recitation period may be put to excellent use by reading aloud any good themes, and pointing out what makes them interesting. Nothing pleases or encourages one so much as to hear his writings read aloud; and an additional stimulus to the whole class will be found in the secret hope of this kind of publication. Another device helpful at times is to assign a single subject—April Fool's Day, for example, if it is the proper season—and in connection with the corrected composition read a masterly bit of writing on the same subject, as Lamb's "All Fool's Day;" always putting the essay so read on your "Voluntary Reading" shelf.¹

Much argument has been raised against examinations in English; I think too much. Pupils do not, or need not, have that dread of examinations which we all bewail. All but the veriest loafers rather like to see what they can do in a limited time; provided, of course, that their whole scholastic salvation does not hinge on the results of that particular examination. In college, I used to enjoy my examinations in English, especially those questions that suddenly presented an old subject in a totally new light. Examinations which call for a mere recital of facts are pernicious; but they, like all other parts of teaching, can and should be made interesting.

Here again, as with all other devices in teaching the English language and literature, the system is nothing under the wrong teacher. The essential thing is that the pupil be led to read and to enjoy as widely as possible our vast literature; and that under the inspiration of these masterpieces, he be encouraged to speak and to write as effectually as he can whatever he has to say. In both of these the dull, the ignorant teacher will fail, whatever his method. Yet they are teachable things; teachable by those who

¹ Suggestive articles on composition work are: BARBOUR F. A., *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. VI, p. 500; HILL, A. S., *Our English*, chap. 1, pp. 1-71; HURLBUT, B. S., *Academy*, Vol. VII, p. 257; MARBLE, A. P., *Educational Review*, Vol. III, p. 22; WIGHT, J. G., *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. I, p. 15; and THURBER, S., *Education*, Vol. XIV, p. 193, Vol. XVIII, p. 515; *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. I, p. 15, Vol. II, pp. 13, 384, 468, 540, *SCHOOL REVIEW*, Vol. V, p. 7; *Academy*, Vol. IV, p. 421, and Vol. V, pp. 354 and 459.

themselves have supreme interest in supreme books, and who themselves are eager to express well what they express at all. The English in secondary schools will reach its acme when such teachers—putting aside for their private edification all scientific study—put heart and soul into the pleasurable task of leading their pupils to the enjoyment of good books, and the simple, correct expression of their most interesting thoughts.

ALLAN ABBOTT

THE WASHINGTON SCHOOL FOR BOYS,
Washington, D. C.